



Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act

**Annual Report
March 2007**

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Corrections Standards Authority**

Juvenile Justice

Crime Prevention Act

Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2007

**Corrections Standards Authority
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.csa.ca.gov**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

James E. Tilton, *Secretary*

CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

Members

James E. Tilton, *Chair*

David Runnels

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Adult Offenders*

Bernard Warner

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Juvenile Offenders*

David Bacigalupo

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Robert Hernandez

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Vacant

*Sheriff
(jail based rated capacity of 200 inmates or less)*

Gary S. Penrod

*Sheriff
(jail based rated capacity of over 200 inmates)*

William Powers

County Supervisor/Administrator Officer

Calvin C. Remington

*Chief Probation Officer
(county over 200,000 population)*

Vacant

*Chief Probation Officer
(county under 200,000 population)*

John Ingrassia

*Administrator
Local Detention Facility*

Mimi H. Silbert, Ph.D.

*Administrator
Local Community-Based Correctional Program*

Kim Petersen

*Public Member
Represents Interests of Crime Victims*

Carol Biondi

Public Member

Pamala M. Gilyard

*Rank and File Representative
Juvenile Probation Officer*

Cleotha Adams

*Rank and File Representative
Deputy Sheriff*

Karrie Eckhardt

*Rank and File Representative
State Parole Officer*

Vacant

*Rank and File Representative
State Adult Correctional Facility*

Max L. Scott

*Representative
Community-Based Youth Service Organization*

Staff

C. Scott Harris Jr., Executive Director

Corrections Planning & Programs Division
Marlon Yarber, *Deputy Director*

Facilities Standards & Operations Division
Robert J. Takeshta, *Deputy Director*

Standards & Training for Corrections Division
Debbie Rives, *Deputy Director*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
An Overview of the Program	2-3
■ Local Planning Process	
■ Program Evaluation	
■ Program Administration	
Statewide Evaluation	4-5
■ Program Expenditures	
■ Mandated Outcomes	
■ Local Outcomes	
County Program Highlights	6-10
Appendices	
A. Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary	
B. Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs	
C. Change in County Arrest Rate	

Executive Summary

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) supports probation programs that have proven effective in reducing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth and young offenders. In 2005-06 the JJCPA supported 162 programs implemented by counties to address locally identified needs in the continuum of responses to juvenile crime.

The Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) is responsible for administering the JJCPA and must submit annual reports to the Legislature on: 1) the local planning process; 2) program expenditures; and 3) six mandated juvenile justice outcomes (Government Code Section 30061[4]). This fifth annual report addresses each of these issues.

Local Planning Process: The JJCPA required counties to establish and maintain a multiagency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) for the purpose of developing, reviewing and updating a comprehensive plan that documents the condition of the local juvenile justice system and outlines proposed efforts to fill identified service gaps. Chief Probation Officers and other JJCC members report a great deal of satisfaction with the enhanced communication, coordination and collaboration resulting from this planning process.

Program Expenditures: By June 30, 2006, the 56 counties participating in the JJCPA had expended or encumbered 99.9 percent of the \$99.7 million allocated for the fifth year of the initiative. Local programs served 106,268 at-risk youth and young offenders in 2005-06, for a per capita cost to the State of \$937.14. Considering there were 98,703 participants in the first year of the JJCPA, with a per capita cost of \$1,201.53, the numbers for 2005-06 demonstrate the ongoing commitment of counties and community based organizations (CBOs) to providing cost effective services to as many at-risk youth and young offenders as possible.

Juvenile Justice Outcomes: The data submitted by counties for 2005-06 indicate that the JJCPA programs continue to have a positive impact on juvenile crime and delinquency in communities throughout California. This is evident in the results for the mandated juvenile justice outcomes as well as education outcomes tracked by a number of counties. For example:

- Youth participating in JJCPA programs were arrested for new crimes and incarcerated at significantly lower rates than youth in a comparable reference group.
- JJCPA participants successfully completed probation at significantly higher rates than youth in the comparison group.
- JJCPA youth attended a significantly greater percentage of school days, achieved significantly higher grade point averages, and were significantly less likely to be suspended or expelled from school than reference group youth.

Because the efforts supported by the JJCPA are collaborative and build upon strategies that have proven successful in the past, CSA staff believes this initiative will continue making a positive impact on public safety well into the future.

Statistically significant results were reported in three of the six mandated outcomes--arrest, incarceration and probation violation rates, and probation, restitution, and community service completion rates. The arrest rate average for program participants in 129 of the programs was reported at 26.2 percent, in comparison to the reference group arrest rate at 32.5 percent. For 133 of the programs, the incarceration rate average was 21.5 percent for program participants, and 25.3 percent for the reference group. Lastly, for 106 of the programs, the average rate of completion of probation was 26.8 percent for program participants, and 22.3 percent for the reference group.

In addition to the mandated outcomes, the JJCPA programs report on many local outcomes, some of which are common enough to permit the aggregation of findings. The most widely reported local outcomes pertain to conduct and achievement in school. Outcome results for 13 programs indicated an average of 87.2 percent of school days attended by program youth, as compared to 78.5 percent of school days attended by the reference group. For 10 programs, we observed fewer average suspensions and expulsions by program youth; 18.7 percent of program youth were suspended compared to 28.7 percent for the reference group, and 5.3 percent of program youth were expelled from school compared to 7.7 percent for the reference group. Finally, for 15 of the programs, the average grade point average for program youth was 2.21 in comparison to 1.65 for youth in the reference group.

An Overview of the Program

The JJCPA program was created by the Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Chapter 353). The Act created a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

The JJCPA involves a partnership between the state of California, 56¹ counties and numerous CBOs to enhance public safety by reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Local officials and stakeholders determine where to direct resources through an interagency planning process; the State appropriates funds, which the Controller's Office distributes to counties on a per capita basis; and community-based organizations play a critical role in delivering services. It is a partnership that recognizes the need for juvenile justice resources and the value of local discretion and multiagency collaboration in addressing the problem of juvenile crime in our communities.

Local Planning Process

State policies have increasingly recognized the need to strengthen the local juvenile justice system and its array of alternatives and graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders through a comprehensive local planning process that requires probation departments to coordinate their activities with other key stakeholders.

The programs funded by the JJCPA address a continuum of responses to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders—prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration—and respond to specific problems associated with these populations in each county.

To receive the initial JJCPA allocation, counties had to develop a comprehensive multiagency juvenile justice plan that included an assessment of existing resources targeting at-risk youth, juvenile offenders and their families as well as a local action strategy for addressing identified gaps in the continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency. Each year, counties must update and, as needed, modify their plan, which must be approved by staff of the CSA before funds can be expended.²

To help ensure coordination and collaboration among the various local agencies serving at-risk youth and young offenders, the JJCPA entrusted development and modification of the plan to a JJCC chaired by the county's Chief Probation Officer and comprised of representatives of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, the board of supervisors, social services, education, mental health and CBOs. The JJCCs typically meet monthly or quarterly to review program progress and evaluation data.

Chief Probation Officers and other JJCC members continue to report a great deal of satisfaction with the JJCPA planning process, noting that it maximizes their ability to implement or expand programs tailored to the specific populations and needs of their local jurisdiction. In addition to pointing out that juvenile justice planning has become more strategic, integrated, and outcome oriented, JJCC members have underscored the value of sharing information regarding youth

¹ Alpine and Sierra Counties chose not to participate in this program.

² Prior to the July 2005 reorganization of the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency, the CSA was known as the Board of Corrections.

programs across the many disciplines involved in the JJCPA programs. The creation of JJCC's has corresponded with an increase in the number of counties developing programs utilizing comprehensive wraparound services for youth.

Program Evaluation

JJCPA requires that funded programs be modeled on evidence based strategies that have proven effective in curbing juvenile delinquency. The JJCPA also requires counties to collect and report information on annual program expenditures and juvenile justice outcomes. At the local level, these evaluation activities enable stakeholders to assess progress toward desired goals, refine their programs, and target available resources. These evaluation efforts also enable the Legislature to monitor the investment the State has made in the JJCPA and assess its overall impact on juvenile crime and delinquency.

Counties are statutorily required to report data for six mandated outcomes: 1) arrest rate; 2) incarceration rate; 3) probation violation rate; 4) probation completion rate; 5) restitution completion rate; and 6) community service completion rate. However, some of these outcomes are not applicable to prevention programs and/or similar efforts directed towards at-risk juveniles. For example, a truancy prevention program serving primarily middle school students would not be expected to have an impact on the completion of probation rate. Therefore, counties report outcome data only on those variables applicable to their programs.

In addition to the mandated outcomes, many counties track and report on local outcomes specific to their individual programs. Some of these local outcomes are related to education and may involve tracking school attendance, grade point averages, and school behavior reports.

Program Administration

The Legislature charged the CSA with administering the JJCPA and reporting annually on: 1) the overall effectiveness of the local planning process; 2) program expenditures for each county; and 3) the six statutorily mandated outcome variables.

In administering the JJCPA, CSA staff has worked closely with the chairs and members of the JJCC in developing and updating their comprehensive juvenile justice plan, which must be approved by the CSA each year before counties may begin spending their JJCPA funds. This effort includes extensive technical assistance, at the request of counties, in identifying and documenting programmatic strategies that have proven effective in reducing juvenile crime, determining appropriate evaluation designs for the proposed programs, and problem solving on issues related to program implementation and evaluation.

CSA staff annually reviews evaluation results to ensure that counties are complying with statutory requirements and to offer suggestions for continued improvement in the delivery of effective corrections programs.

Statewide Evaluation

Program Expenditures

The counties participating in the JJCPA program expended 99.9 percent of the \$99,711,729 allocated in 2005-06 (see Appendix A–Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary). Counties also spent \$4,024,592 in interest earned on State funds and \$19,023,783 in non-JJCPA funds to support program activities. Although not required, the infusion of local resources demonstrates the counties’ commitment to the goals of the JJCPA and significantly leverages the State’s investment in deterring youth from criminal activity. A total of 106,268 minors participated in the 162 JJCPA programs in 2005-06, which translates into an average per capita cost to the State (JJCPA funds) of \$937.14 (see Appendix B–Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs).

Juvenile Justice Outcomes

As required by law, the statewide evaluation of the JJCPA focuses on six legislatively mandated outcomes: arrest, incarceration and probation violation rates; and probation, restitution, and community service completion rates. The data collected by counties on these six variables clearly indicate that the JJCPA programs continue to have the intended effect of curbing juvenile crime and delinquency in California.³

Outcome results reported by counties for fiscal year 2005-06 on juveniles who completed the full evaluation period indicate statistically significant differences (at .05 significance level) in the desired direction on three of the six mandated outcomes. These results are summarized in Table A.

TABLE A
Statistically Significant Results on Juvenile Justice Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs with Available Results	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
Arrest Rate	129	26.2%	32.5%
Incarceration Rate	133	21.5%	25.3%
Completion of Probation	106	26.8%	22.3%

For one of the three remaining mandated outcomes—completion of community service—the results were in the desired direction but not quite statistically significant, with an average of 43.8 percent of program juveniles completing community service compared to 38.9 percent of reference group juveniles (61 programs).

³ For most outcomes, counties assess their progress by comparing the results for participating minors and a reference group (i.e., participants prior to entering the program, prior program participants, juveniles comparable to those who received program services, or some other external reference group). The length and timing of the evaluation periods vary from program to program. For example, one program might compare the arrest rate of participants for the three month period prior to program entry with their arrest rate during the first three months of the program, whereas another program might use a longer time period and compare the arrest rate prior to program entry with the arrest rate following program exit.

As was the case in fiscal year 2004-05, results for the mandated outcome-completion of restitution-were not statistically significant, with the average completion rate of 27.3 percent for program juveniles being only slightly higher than the 26.8 percent completion rate for reference group juveniles (62 programs).

Results for the remaining mandated outcome probation violation rate-were also consistent with findings in previous years in that the average rates were approximately the same for the two groups in the 97 programs for which results were available (30.9 percent for the program juveniles; 29.7 percent for the reference group juveniles). As noted in previous reports, these findings are not surprising given that many of the programs involve increased levels of supervision, thus increasing the likelihood of detecting probation violations when they occur.

Results for arrest rate were also positive in counties opting to use a different method to measure program impact (i.e., average number vs. percentage), with the average number of arrests being significantly lower for youth in the 20 programs measured in this manner.

The enabling legislation also requires that all counties specify a goal or expectation for change in the annual countywide arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles aged 10 to 17. Each county also specifies a baseline (i.e., reference) year. In most cases, the baseline for this reporting period is 2004. Results for this measure are presented for the most recent reporting year (2005) in Appendix C.

A total of 25 counties expected the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles to go down; 24 counties expected no change; and 7 counties expected the rate to go up. The rate went down in 15 (60 percent) of the counties that expected a decline, and in 10 (41.7 percent) of the counties that expected no change. Overall, the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles declined slightly from 4,879 in 2004 to 4,869 in 2005 for the 56 counties that participated in the JJCPA, continuing the trend of reductions that have occurred each year since the JJCPA took effect.

Education Outcomes

In addition to the mandated outcomes, the JJCPA programs report on many local outcomes, some of which are common to a sufficient number of programs to permit the aggregation of findings. The most widely reported local outcomes pertain to conduct and achievement in school. As shown in Table B, the results for these outcomes are quite impressive. Program juveniles, on average, attended a significantly greater percentage of school days and achieved significantly higher grade point averages. In addition, program juveniles were significantly less likely to be suspended or expelled from school than reference group juveniles.

TABLE B
Summary of Local Results on Education Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs Reporting Results	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
% School Days Attended	13	87.2%	78.5%
% Suspended from School	10	18.7%	28.7%
% Expelled from School	10	5.3%	7.7%
Grade Point Average	15	2.21	1.65

County Program Highlights

During the 2005-06 fiscal year there were 162 programs in the 56 participating counties. The JJCPA recognizes the importance of a continuum of responses to the complex problem of juvenile crime and delinquency—from prevention, intervention and supervision to treatment and incapacitation (i.e., commitment to a local juvenile facility). The local planning and decision making process inherent in JJCPA resulted in the implementation, improvement and/or expansion of a variety of juvenile justice efforts, as evidenced by the following examples.

Prevention/Early Intervention

The following programs, typically referred to as prevention/early intervention programs, focus on keeping at-risk youth from entering the juvenile justice system and preventing first time offenders from further involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Fresno County's Students Targeted with Opportunities for Prevention (STOP) program provides prevention and early intervention services to youth ages 10 to 14 years old who are identified as being at risk of entering the justice system. The program utilizes multidisciplinary teams consisting of mental health clinicians, probation officers, school staff, and various CBOs to provide comprehensive services. The program served 784 minors and their families in 2005-06.

This is the fifth year of operation for the STOP program. The STOP program model was duplicated from Fresno County's Youth Community Challenge Program. The STOP program data continues to show improvement in attendance at school, participation in the afterschool program, grade point average, and suspensions/expulsions rates. Although STOP reported six arrests for a 1.27 percent arrest rate, that number is a significant reduction from the 16 arrests (5.3 percent arrest rate) during the 2004-05 year.

Program services are provided at various sites throughout the county, in large part through contracts with CBOs. In addition to CBOs, the probation department is collaborating with schools, and law enforcement to provide wraparound services for clients.

The California Wellness Foundation has recognized the STOP program as a model violence prevention strategy, and the program received the 2005 Distinguished Program Award from the California State Juvenile Officers' Association.

Los Angeles County's Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT) program seeks to improve elementary school attendance among at-risk youth and youth on probation through parent and child accountability. The program served 3,530 minors during the 2005-06 program year. Recognizing that truancy is a major precursor to delinquency, the ACT program works to ensure that youth with a demonstrated pattern of excessive absenteeism attend school every day. Deputy District Attorneys involve youth and their parent(s) in a series of graduated interventions:

- Meeting with parents and their children in a group session, with the assistance of CBOs and school personnel who can provide families with additional resources (e.g., parenting classes, counseling).

- Holding individual meetings when youth continue to miss school in order to discuss possible legal consequences and provide referrals to appropriate treatment agencies (with a contract outlining responsibilities of the agencies, parents, and youths).
- Filing a case against the parent(s) and/or youth for failure to take appropriate action.

San Diego County's Community Assessment and Working to Insure and Nurture Girls' Success (CA/WINGS) Teams Program strives to reduce the number of youth who enter the juvenile justice system or reoffend while on probation by providing case management services and teaching families how to access other community services.

Prior to July 2003 the CA/WINGS were separate programs. The blending of these two successful programs achieved significant cost savings, strengthened collaborative relationships, and expanded the services provided to the target population (at-risk youth and young offenders, ages 6-17).

Based at five locations in the county, mobile multidisciplinary teams provide services (including gender-specific interventions) to address issues related to anger management, violence, alcohol and drug use, gang involvement, school failure, and other anti-social behaviors. Probation Officers are assigned to each region and work with contracted agency staff as part of the teams, which also provide in-home assessment services and link families to appropriate community based resources.

The county reports 7,630 youth were referred to the program in 2005-06. Of the number referred, 5,904 youth and families were directly connected to resources in the community, and 1,726 received case management services.

Intervention and Supervision

The following programs focus on providing comprehensive intervention and supervision services for juvenile offenders in order to facilitate the minors' successful completion of probation and help them avoid further criminal behavior.

Sacramento County's Day Reporting Center (DRC) provides intensive supervision and a wide variety of educational and mental health services to high risk juveniles, ages 10 to 16, who have committed misdemeanors or nonviolent felonies and have at least two identified risk factors (e.g., substance abuse, family violence, poor school attendance).

Each juvenile in the program is individually assessed for risk level (Probation Department), for mental health and counseling needs (Department of Health and Human Services' Mental Health Division), and for education needs (Sacramento County Office of Education). A multidisciplinary team reviews the assessments within seven days of the juvenile's acceptance date and develops an Individual Treatment and Supervision Plan (ITSP), which becomes a "behavior contract" signed by the minors and their parents/caretaker. The team revises the ITSP as needed during the program and uses it to make appropriate service referrals upon the minor's completion of the program. The DRC served 288 youth in 2005-06 and provided counseling to participant's family members.

Students failing in regular school settings must attend the on-site DRC school, while those students with satisfactory performance may continue at their original school and then report to the DRC after each school day. The DRC offers a multipurpose learning center with computer stations, a multimedia center and space for group counseling sessions. Through the Probation Department's collaboration with numerous public and private agencies, youth receive an array of services, including tutoring, mentoring, and leadership training; anger management, gang awareness, and victim impact classes; health education and substance abuse counseling; life skills development; and work experience.

In December 2005 Sacramento County's Day Reporting Center received a Merit Award from the California State Association of Counties.

San Francisco County's Life Learning Academy (LLA) is a nonresidential charter school based on the Delancey Street Foundation model, including the principle of "reciprocal restitution"—i.e., the students make restitution to society through community service and personal accountability, and society restores to these underclass youths genuine opportunities to enter mainstream society successfully and legitimately. The LLA serves high school aged youths who are involved in the juvenile justice system and/or have problems including serious school failure, family problems, gang involvement, poverty, abuse, and substance abuse. The LLA served 56 students in 2005-06.

The LLA has had a positive effect on crime and delinquency in San Francisco, including significantly reduced involvement with the juvenile justice system (both in terms of first arrests and recidivism), successful completion of probation, and reduced out-of-home placements. In addition, the LLA has resulted in dramatic achievements in student attendance, performance, and graduation.

The LLA has received extensive acknowledgement for its work. In 2002 the LLA was one of three schools statewide to receive a California Department of Education Dissemination Grant, which resulted in over 150 California educators visiting the school to learn about the program and curriculum. The LLA has also had visitors from around the United States and other countries, including Japan, Australia, England, Israel, and Singapore, and replication of the LLA model is occurring in Alaska, Massachusetts, South Carolina, and four California counties. In January 2004 the LLA received accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges; in June 2004 the LLA was the only school to be named one of 15 finalists in Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government Innovations in American Government Awards. In October 2005 LLA's Principal was one of 25 secondary school principals nationwide to receive a \$5,000 award to implement an initiative to strengthen ties between faculty and the surrounding community. This competitive award is part of a National Association of Secondary School Principals/MetLife Foundation initiative.

Ventura County's Habitual Offender Prevention Endeavor (HOPE) Program, which is a Repeat Offender Prevention Program (ROPP), is a comprehensive multidisciplinary probation supervision and intervention program for juvenile offenders who demonstrate three of the four standard risk factors for chronic offending (school behavior and performance problems; family problems; substance abuse; and high-risk predelinquent behavior).

The primary objective of HOPE, which served 165 youth in 2005-06, is to provide early identification and services to high risk repeat offenders. A few of the programs broadly defined goals include breaking the patterns of delinquency, anti-social behavior, and family violence by

providing services before the youth become heavily entrenched in the juvenile justice system. A case plan is developed by a multidisciplinary team comprised of probation officers, therapists, and substance abuse counselors from CBOs. Each plan outlines specific services, programs and activities that the minor and his or her family will participate in, along with anticipated goals and outcomes. Services provided include: (1) individual, family, and group counseling; (2) parenting education and support groups; (3) conflict resolution and anger management classes; (4) substance abuse education and treatment groups; (5) tutoring; (6) recreational opportunities; (7) pregnancy prevention education; and (8) domestic violence/sexual abuse survivor counseling groups.

Deputy Probation Officers (DPO) monitor compliance through typical probation tools, including testing for drug use, monitoring school attendance, conducting home searches, and when necessary for the safety of the community or youth, making arrests. Small caseloads allow for a minimum of weekly contacts by the DPO and/or therapist. Most of the contacts and the majority of therapy occur with the family and the minor together.

Treatment and Incapacitation

The following programs focus on providing juvenile offenders treatment services in a secure detention setting and aftercare/transition services.

Humboldt County's New Horizons is a regional secure juvenile facility program that targets 12 to 18 year old wards of the court who have a diagnosed mental illness and who are at risk of out-of-home placement or have a history of treatment failure in open residential settings. Located in Eureka, the program served a total of 51 emotionally disturbed youth in 2005-06.

The New Horizons program, housed at the Northern California Regional Facility, offers an intensive treatment based program for juveniles within a secure facility. The program offers individual, group, and family therapy; substance abuse treatment and education groups; independent living skills training; an on-site school; and a structured behavior modification system. The goals of the program are three-fold:

- To teach participants how to develop and maintain a nondelinquent and drug/alcohol free lifestyle in order to prevent further intrusion into the juvenile justice system.
- To improve participants' compliance with court ordered conditions of probation.
- To maintain public safety through high standards of accountability and intensive supervision.

Referrals to the program come from the Probation Department. The maximum length of stay in the 18-bed facility is 6 months.

New Horizons provides direct access to intensive mental health and behavioral services, thus enabling the Probation Department to free up beds in the juvenile hall for more serious and/or chronic offenders. Program enhancements include adjustments in the referral/intake process, which have expedited the delivery of services, and a restructuring of the in-custody phase to emphasize timely transition planning, which has allowed the program to serve more youth.

The New Horizons program, which was featured in a segment of Public Broadcasting System' (PBS) California Connected, continues to make a positive difference in the lives of participants. The county also reports a significant improvement in mental health outcomes, as evidenced by scores on the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale, a clinician-based assessment of youth impairment in eight key areas.

Santa Barbara County's Aftercare Services Program targets high risk minors who are transitioning back into their home from group and foster home placements, as well as, from the county's boot camps and juvenile hall. While in placement, minors receive intensive supervision and treatment that often lead to significant changes. The Aftercare Services Program is designed to bolster that foundation of success once the minor returns home by identifying and building upon family strengths, and by creating a support network of services and programs to assist minors in establishing a different lifestyle and new peer group upon their return to the community.

This program commences when minors first enter an out-of-home placement. Meetings between designated Placement Officers (Senior Deputy Probation Officers), the minors, and their families serve to outline behavioral, attitudinal and educational expectations, as well as free time programming. Approximately four weeks prior to their transition home, the Placement Officer and Aftercare Services staff begin the establishment of a specific weekly Aftercare Plan. Following three to six months of successful aftercare behavior, a minor's case may be transferred to a traditional juvenile supervision caseload for continued monitoring. Santa Barbara County reported that 208 minors received services during 2005-06.

Tulare County's Ember Aftercare Program provides two fulltime Probation Officers who work closely with Mental Health and Drug and Alcohol Specialists on integrated case management and enforcement activities. The program is specifically focused on minors who have completed a residential camp commitment in the Youth Facility. The Youth Facility program is a 365-day court ordered commitment that includes the Residential Program and the Ember Aftercare Program. Minors typically spend approximately four to six months in residence as a cadet in the Youth Facility prior to entering the Ember Aftercare Program. The aftercare program provides integrated case management and a balanced, restorative justice approach to juvenile aftercare clients. Ember Aftercare helps to reintegrate youth back into their schools and communities, and offers both support and swift sanctions. Aftercare Officers check on school and counseling attendance, along with behavior issues both at home and at school. Program accountability is supplied by a schedule of graduated sanctions that include a return to the Residential Program for 3, 30, 60, or 90 days, for violations of the Terms and Conditions of Probation and the rules and regulations of the Ember Aftercare Program.

Tulare County reported that 559 minors received services during the 2005-06 program year. Notable positive statistics from the 2005-06 program year were reported for the following mandated outcomes: an increase in Completion of Probation, a decrease in Incarceration Rate, increase in Rate of Completion of Restitution, and a decrease in Probation Violation Rate.

The county reports that the Ember Aftercare Program has positively impacted the juvenile offenders who are committed to the Youth Facility by greatly improving their ability to successfully transition back into the community. The inclusion of the Ember Aftercare Program as a vital component of the total Youth Facility commitment has strengthened the overall program.

APPENDIX A: Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary ⁴

County	State Fund Expenditures	Interest Expenditures	Non-JJCPA Fund Expenditures	Total Expenditures	State Fund Allocations
Alameda	\$4,133,388	\$61,636	\$949,699	\$5,144,723	\$4,133,388
Amador	\$101,629	\$2,786	\$17,200	\$121,615	\$101,629
Butte	\$587,083	\$0	\$393,193	\$980,276	\$587,083
Calaveras	\$119,577	\$5,017	\$0	\$124,594	\$119,577
Colusa	\$55,471	\$5,051	\$0	\$60,522	\$55,471
Contra Costa	\$2,770,491	\$39,551	\$1,425,292	\$4,235,334	\$2,770,491
Del Norte	\$77,943	\$0	\$65,998	\$143,941	\$77,943
El Dorado	\$463,933	\$19,351	\$100,026	\$583,310	\$463,933
Fresno	\$2,380,004	\$117,086	\$6,496	\$2,503,586	\$2,380,004
Glenn	\$76,563	\$1,378	\$3,207	\$81,148	\$76,563
Humboldt	\$358,510	\$9,764	\$849,355	\$1,217,629	\$358,510
Imperial	\$431,928	\$6,000	\$0	\$437,928	\$431,928
Inyo	\$51,125	\$0	\$0	\$51,125	\$51,125
Kern	\$2,000,139	\$118,544	\$277,502	\$2,396,185	\$2,000,139
Kings	\$313,577	\$3,000	\$0	\$316,577	\$390,128
Lake	\$174,440	\$7,616	\$17,248	\$199,304	\$174,440
Lassen	\$96,153	\$0	\$430,319	\$526,472	\$96,153
Los Angeles	\$27,874,194	\$1,460,242	\$0	\$29,334,436	\$27,874,194
Madera	\$373,298	\$20,659	\$0	\$393,957	\$373,298
Marin	\$690,257	\$14,868	\$0	\$705,125	\$690,257
Mariposa	\$48,697	\$1,226	\$0	\$49,923	\$48,697
Mendocino	\$246,120	\$5,664	\$0	\$251,784	\$246,120
Merced	\$640,553	\$26,137	\$6,967	\$673,657	\$640,553
Modoc	\$26,597	\$200	\$12,000	\$38,797	\$26,597
Mono	\$37,316	\$0	\$3,286	\$40,602	\$37,316
Monterey	\$1,162,894	\$15,000	\$1,381,137	\$2,559,031	\$1,162,894
Napa	\$356,497	\$0	\$0	\$356,497	\$363,117
Nevada	\$265,006	\$8,679	\$0	\$273,685	\$265,006
Orange	\$8,325,544	\$410,414	\$1,639,263	\$10,375,221	\$8,325,544
Placer	\$805,930	\$19,485	\$0	\$825,415	\$805,930
Plumas	\$50,279	\$1,524	\$50,329	\$102,132	\$58,188
Riverside	\$4,902,209	\$104,040	\$60,005	\$5,066,254	\$4,902,209
Sacramento	\$3,684,368	\$174,167	\$896,621	\$4,755,156	\$3,684,368
San Benito	\$153,573	\$6,976	\$0	\$160,549	\$157,596
San Bernardino	\$5,205,069	\$212,201	\$226,882	\$5,644,152	\$5,205,069
San Diego	\$8,323,916	\$402,034	\$5,824,717	\$14,550,667	\$8,323,916
San Francisco	\$2,185,920	\$0	\$1,364,175	\$3,550,095	\$2,187,092
San Joaquin	\$1,739,989	\$0	\$0	\$1,739,989	\$1,739,989
San Luis Obispo	\$712,315	\$16,940	\$89,317	\$818,572	\$712,315
San Mateo	\$1,965,610	\$115,005	\$1,386,021	\$3,466,636	\$1,965,610
Santa Barbara	\$1,144,271	\$48,604	\$859,673	\$2,052,548	\$1,144,271
Santa Clara	\$4,776,728	\$222,516	\$0	\$4,999,244	\$4,776,728
Santa Cruz	\$718,040	\$26,322	\$84,547	\$828,909	\$718,040
Shasta	\$484,764	\$9,997	\$148,559	\$643,320	\$484,764
Siskiyou	\$123,729	\$5,231	\$0	\$128,960	\$123,729
Solano	\$1,149,210	\$40,455	\$0	\$1,189,665	\$1,149,210
Sonoma	\$1,304,544	\$34,101	\$0	\$1,338,645	\$1,304,544
Stanislaus	\$1,357,103	\$28,310	\$0	\$1,385,413	\$1,357,103
Sutter	\$235,898	\$10,000	\$103,165	\$349,063	\$235,898
Tehama	\$150,501	\$0	\$0	\$150,501	\$161,997
Trinity	\$37,109	\$1,594	\$0	\$38,703	\$37,109
Tulare	\$1,094,856	\$34,605	\$0	\$1,129,461	\$1,094,856
Tuolumne	\$157,127	\$2,964	\$0	\$160,091	\$157,127
Ventura	\$2,214,130	\$136,220	\$351,584	\$2,701,934	\$2,214,130
Yolo	\$492,700	\$11,432	\$0	\$504,132	\$508,974
Yuba	\$178,869	\$0	\$0	\$178,869	\$178,869
TOTALS	\$99,587,684	\$4,024,592	\$19,023,783	\$122,636,059	\$99,711,729

⁴ Alpine and Sierra counties did not apply for JJCPA funding. Allocation amounts of \$3,532 (Alpine County) and \$9,739 (Sierra County) would have been available.

APPENDIX B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs

County	Programs	Program	Average Per Capita Cost	
		Participants	JJCPA Funds	All Funds
Alameda	1	862	\$4,795.11	\$5,968.36
Amador	1	107	\$949.80	\$1,136.59
Butte	4	542	\$1,083.18	\$1,808.63
Calaveras	2	80	\$1,494.71	\$1,557.42
Colusa	1	106	\$523.31	\$570.96
Contra Costa	4	1,190	\$2,328.14	\$3,559.10
Del Norte	1	92	\$847.21	\$1,564.58
El Dorado	1	169	\$2,745.17	\$3,451.54
Fresno	1	784	\$3,035.72	\$3,193.35
Glenn	1	20	\$3,828.15	\$4,057.40
Humboldt	2	384	\$933.62	\$3,170.91
Imperial	3	3,635	\$118.82	\$120.48
Inyo	2	601	\$85.07	\$85.07
Kern	2	437	\$4,576.98	\$5,483.26
Kings	1	185	\$1,695.01	\$1,711.23
Lake	1	91	\$1,916.92	\$2,190.15
Lassen	3	786	\$122.33	\$669.81
Los Angeles	14	29,116	\$957.35	\$1,007.50
Madera	1	234	\$1,595.29	\$1,683.58
Marin	3	339	\$2,036.16	\$2,080.01
Mariposa	1	238	\$204.61	\$209.76
Mendocino	2	277	\$888.52	\$908.97
Merced	1	533	\$1,201.79	\$1,263.90
Modoc	1	13	\$2,045.92	\$2,984.38
Mono	1	32	\$1,166.12	\$1,268.81
Monterey	8	5,201	\$223.59	\$492.03
Napa	1	233	\$1,530.03	\$1,530.03
Nevada	2	153	\$1,732.07	\$1,788.79
Orange	10	3,451	\$2,412.50	\$3,006.44
Placer	3	1,256	\$641.66	\$657.18
Plumas	1	174	\$288.96	\$586.97
Riverside	2	1,221	\$4,014.91	\$4,149.27
Sacramento	2	1,342	\$2,745.43	\$3,543.34
San Benito	1	24	\$6,398.88	\$6,689.54
San Bernardino	5	10,851	\$479.69	\$520.15
San Diego	4	5,762	\$1,444.62	\$2,525.28
San Francisco	9	2,717	\$804.53	\$1,306.62
San Joaquin	3	1,559	\$1,116.09	\$1,116.09
San Luis Obispo	1	569	\$1,251.87	\$1,438.62
San Mateo	6	1,556	\$1,263.25	\$2,227.92
Santa Barbara	3	13,398	\$85.41	\$153.20
Santa Clara	5	8,222	\$580.97	\$608.03
Santa Cruz	2	435	\$1,650.67	\$1,905.54
Shasta	4	874	\$554.65	\$736.06
Siskiyou	1	122	\$1,014.17	\$1,057.05
Solano	5	1,226	\$937.37	\$970.36
Sonoma	6	397	\$3,286.01	\$3,371.90
Stanislaus	3	1,010	\$1,343.67	\$1,371.70
Sutter	3	129	\$1,828.67	\$2,705.91
Tehama	1	60	\$2,508.35	\$2,508.35
Trinity	1	44	\$843.39	\$879.61
Tulare	3	1,359	\$805.63	\$831.10
Tuolumne	1	56	\$2,805.84	\$2,858.77
Ventura	6	1,777	\$1,245.99	\$1,520.50
Yolo	3	133	\$3,704.51	\$3,790.47
Yuba	2	104	\$1,719.89	\$1,719.89
TOTALS	162	106,268	\$937.14	\$1,154.03

APPENDIX C: Change in County Arrest Rates per 100,000 Juveniles Age 10-17

County	Baseline (Year)	Expectation	Current (2005)	Change	Meet/Exceed Expectations
Alameda	4962 (2000)	Decrease	3671	-1291	Yes
Amador	4230 (2004)	No Change	5250	1020	No
Butte	6164 (2004)	Increase	5815	-349	Yes
Calaveras	5464 (2004)	Decrease	5050	-414	Yes
Colusa	2302 (2004)	Increase	4140	1838	Yes
Contra Costa	3307 (2004)	Decrease	2870	-437	Yes
Del Norte	7190 (2004)	No Change	5466	-1724	Yes
El Dorado	4321 (2004)	Decrease	3613	-708	Yes
Fresno	6334 (2004)	Decrease	5889	-445	Yes
Glenn	15697 (2004)	Decrease	14133	-1564	Yes
Humboldt	5409 (2004)	Decrease	5648	239	No
Imperial	3531 (2004)	Increase	3856	325	Yes
Inyo	3458 (2004)	No Change	3640	182	No
Kern	5420 (2004)	No Change	4923	-497	Yes
Kings	13836 (2004)	No Change	14034	198	No
Lake	6141 (2004)	No Change	6077	-64	Yes
Lassen	3731 (2004)	Decrease	4984	1253	No
Los Angeles	4299 (2004)	Decrease	4416	117	No
Madera	3357 (2004)	Increase	3373	16	Yes
Marin	6124 (2004)	Decrease	6441	317	No
Mariposa	3903 (2004)	No Change	5034	1131	No
Mendocino	7454 (2004)	Decrease	6505	-949	Yes
Merced	8205 (2004)	No Change	7430	-775	Yes
Modoc	1241 (2004)	Decrease	2424	1183	No
Mono	3594 (2004)	No Change	1151	-2443	Yes
Monterey	6608 (2004)	No Change	5821	-787	Yes
Napa	3699 (2004)	Decrease	3789	90	No
Nevada	6612 (2004)	No Change	7781	1169	No
Orange	6646 (1997)	Decrease	3528	-3118	Yes
Placer	3914 (2004)	No Change	4179	265	No
Plumas	10214 (2004)	Increase	13318	3104	Yes
Riverside	3386 (2004)	Decrease	3358	-28	Yes
Sacramento	4030 (2004)	No Change	3830	-200	Yes
San Benito	3934 (2004)	No Change	4568	634	No
San Bernardino	6409 (2004)	No Change	6608	199	No
San Diego	5381 (2004)	Decrease	5109	-272	Yes
San Francisco	3871 (2004)	No Change	4196	325	No
San Joaquin	7178 (2004)	Decrease	7398	220	No
San Luis Obispo	3847 (2004)	Decrease	4305	458	No
San Mateo	3899 (2004)	No Change	3916	17	No
Santa Barbara	11039 (1996)	No Change	7609	-3430	Yes
Santa Clara	5020 (2004)	No Change	6268	1248	No
Santa Cruz	6007 (2004)	Decrease	5753	-254	Yes
Shasta	9014 (2004)	No Change	7850	-1164	Yes
Siskiyou	5822 (2004)	No Change	6006	184	No
Solano	6370 (2004)	Decrease	7851	1481	No
Sonoma	5000 (2004)	Increase	5229	229	Yes
Stanislaus	5888 (2004)	Decrease	5271	-617	Yes
Sutter	5516 (2004)	Increase	5625	109	Yes
Tehama	4354 (2004)	Decrease	5098	744	No
Trinity	3267 (2004)	No Change	4232	965	No
Tulare	6455 (2004)	Decrease	6177	-278	Yes
Tuolumne	8995 (2004)	No Change	6430	-2565	Yes
Ventura	6572 (2004)	Decrease	5939	-633	Yes
Yolo	4725 (2004)	Decrease	4370	-355	Yes
Yuba	4271 (2004)	No Change	5093	822	No
All JJCPA Counties	4879 (2004)		4869	-10	

Source data for Arrest Rates: Criminal Justice Center, California Department of Justice